

1 John F. Lomax, Jr. (#020224)
Brian J. Foster (#012143)
2 Joseph A. Kroeger (#026036)
SNELL & WILMER
3 One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
4 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Telephone: (602) 382-6000
5 Facsimile: (602) 382-6070
Email: jlomax@swlaw.com
6 bfoster@swlaw.com
jkroeger@swlaw.com
7 *Attorneys for Defendant*

8 Anthony R. Pecora
Dennis M. OToole
9 Matthew A. Dooley
STUMPHAUZER OTOOLE MCLAUGHLIN
10 MCGLAMERY & LOUGHMAN COMPANY
5455 Detroit Rd.
11 Sheffield Village, OH 44054
and
12 Leonard Anthony Bennett
Susan Mary Rotkis
13 CONSUMER LITIGATION ASSOCIATES PC
12515 Warwick Blvd., Ste. 100
14 Newport News, VA 23606
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

15
16 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

18 KELVIN D. DANIEL, et al

19
20
21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 SWIFT TRANSPORTATION
CORPORATION,

24
25 Defendant.
26
27
28

Case No. 2:11-cv-01548-PHX-ROS

**JOINT POSITION STATEMENT
RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE**

Assigned to: Hon. Roslyn O. Silver

A. PLAINTIFFS' POSITION.

I. Swift's Untimely Disclosure of 38 New Witnesses and Related Documents One Week Before the Close of Discovery Would Greatly Prejudice Plaintiffs.

Class certification discovery is to close September 14, 2012 with Plaintiff's Rule 23 motion due October 1, 2012. The critical depositions have been completed and a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition on a limited set of topics was set for September 11, 2012. However, at 5:00 PM PT (8:00 PM Eastern Time) the night before, Swift's counsel emailed its "Tenth Disclosure" and hundreds of pages new documents, every one of which was generated at least a month earlier. Included in the production were 117 pages of purported Declarations from 38 previously undisclosed witnesses, most of them current Swift employees Defendant compiled in June and July. The next day, during business hours, Plaintiff initiated a Rule 37 meet and confer attempt and asked that Swift stipulate that such belated production not be used in opposing class certification as none of the new witnesses had ever before been disclosed or identified in discovery. Defendant has not agreed and instead served its "Eleventh Disclosure" formally listing these new 38 individuals as its intended witnesses. Witnesses and documents disclosed by Swift after August 1, 2012 are subject to the automatic exclusion rule under Rule 37(c)(1). *See Int'l Flora Techs., Ltd. v. Clarins U.S.A., Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68889 (D. Ariz. Sept. 4, 2008); *Forbes v. 21st Century Ins. Co.*, 258 F.R.D. 335, 338-39 (D. Ariz. 2009). Swift's counsel has been the subject of similar admonition. *Melczer v. Unum Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 259 F.R.D. 433, 435-36 (D. Ariz. 2009).

II. Swift's Unsupervised and Ex Parte Communications With Absent Class Members Should Be Restricted.

Swift's revelation of its counsel's meetings and communications with and solicitations of declarations from absent class members described above is tantamount to unilateral depositions and absent class member discovery considered by the Court and then barred during the January 10, 2012 Rule 16 conference and in its January 20, 2012 Scheduling Order (Doc. 40). Swift's counsel's unexplained withholding of the identity of

1 and related documents for such individuals until the eve of class certification is even more
2 problematic.

3 While a defendant may communicate with absent class members, it is not without
4 restraint, and is often in the form of a court-approved communication. Swift made no
5 such request, and instead unilaterally engaged in direct communication with these
6 individuals, likely without disclosing the nature of the case or advising the declarants of
7 their right to counsel. *See Facciola v. Greenberg Traurig LLP*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
8 127957, 4-5 (D. Ariz. Nov. 2, 2011). Here, Swift disseminated what appears to be
9 questionnaires to absent class members (mostly current employees) requesting signatures
10 under oath. *See Exhibit A*. As the court stated in *Holman v. Experian Info. Solutions,*
11 *Inc.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91626, 12-13 (N.D. Cal. July 2, 2012): "Responding to the
12 questions is likely to require the assistance of counsel. ... See, e.g., McPhail, 251 F.R.D. at
13 518 (noting that each class member 'would need to confer with Class Counsel to
14 understand the purpose of the request, the penalty for not filing a response, the need to
15 discuss all relevant information, [and] the need to refresh their recollection with
16 documentation" in denying discovery request.' " The same is true here, where Swift never
17 sought leave from the Court to engage absent class members, particularly using seemingly
18 benign questionnaires that carry the penalty of perjury. Accordingly, Swift should be
19 barred from using these declarations and witnesses to support any brief, hearing or at trial.

20 *****

21 *Pursuant to the Court's Standing Order regarding discovery disputes, Plaintiffs'*
22 *and Defendant's counsel certify that they have complied with L.R. 7.2(j) and the Court's*
23 *Rule 16 Order (Doc.40) by attempting in good faith to resolve this dispute on two*
24 *separate occasions through an extended teleconference*

25 **B. DEFENDANT'S POSITION.**

26 Plaintiffs appear to believe that Phase I discovery in this matter closed on August
27 1, but discovery closes on September 14. Over the last few months, Swift has produced
28 over a million pages, prepared for depositions (several of which Plaintiffs canceled

1 without notice), prepared extensive privilege logs, and prepared for a 30(b)(6) deposition
2 noticed by Plaintiffs on August 30, which Plaintiffs canceled earlier this week. Plaintiffs
3 object to the timeliness of the production of declarations Swift obtained in early to mid-
4 August and produced on September 10. Plaintiffs claim Swift's production of
5 declarations warranted the continuation of the 30(b)(6) deposition to a later date, but the
6 declarations bear only the most tenuous connection to the topics designated and narrowed
7 by the parties for that deposition. The declarations were produced approximately one
8 month after obtaining them. Counsel for Swift met personally with the declarants to
9 obtain the declarations. After Swift determined that it would use some of them to oppose
10 certification, it timely produced them. During the meet and confer, Plaintiffs stated that
11 the declarations had limited utility and acknowledged that the subjects addressed in the
12 declarations did not come as a surprise. Indeed, the subjects addressed in the declarations
13 substantiate positions asserted in Swift's prior discovery responses.

14 Plaintiffs have not been prejudiced and are free to contact the declarants. Plaintiffs
15 have had voluminous information identifying putative class members since at least May
16 2012 and were free to contact, and may have already contacted, putative class members,
17 as there was no prohibition on doing so. Indeed, Plaintiffs' counsel has a website
18 soliciting truck drivers to serve as plaintiffs in FCRA matters. Nothing in this Court's
19 Rule 16 Scheduling Order or the hearing leading to the Scheduling Order prohibited either
20 side from contacting putative class members. Indeed, case law expressly permits it.
21 *Munoz v. Ginmana Vineyards, Corp.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9300 3* 17-18 n.4 (E.D.
22 Cal. July 5, 2012); *Parks v. Eastwood Ins. Serv.*, 235 F. Supp. 2d 1082, 1084 (C.D. Cal.
23 2002); *Maddock v. KB Homes, Inc.*, 248 F.R.D. 229, 236-37 (C.D. Cal. 2007). Swift
24 complied with the guidelines established by the courts in contacting the putative class
25 members.

1 DATED this 13th day of September, 2013.

2 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

3
4 By: s/ John F. Lomax, Jr.

5 John F. Lomax, Jr.
6 Brian J. Foster
7 Joseph A. Kroeger
8 One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Attorneys for Defendant

9
10 STUMPHAUZER OTOOLE MCLAUGHLIN
11 MCGLAMERY & LOUGHMAN COMPANY

12
13 By: s/ John F. Lomax, Jr. by permission

14 Anthony R. Pecora
15 Dennis M. OToole
16 Matthew A. Dooley
5455 Detroit Rd.
Sheffield Village, OH 44054

17 Stanley Lubin
18 Nicholas Jason Enoch
19 Lubin & Enoch PC
349 N 4th Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85003

20 and

21 Leonard Anthony Bennett
22 Susan Mary Rotkis
23 Consumer Litigation Associates PC
12515 Warwick Blvd., Ste. 100
Newport News, VA 23606

24 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on September 13, 2012, I transmitted the foregoing Joint Position Statement re Discovery Dispute to Judge Silver's chambers via facsimile (602.322.7529), and electronically transmitted the same to the Clerk's Office using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

Anthony R. Pecora
Dennis M. OToole
Matthew A. Dooley
Stumphauzer OToole McLaughlin
McGlamery & Loughman Company
5455 Detroit Rd.
Sheffield Village, OH 44054

Stanley Lubin
Nicholas Jason Enoch
Lubin & Enoch PC
349 N 4th Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Leonard Anthony Bennett
Susan Mary Rotkis
Consumer Litigation Associates PC
12515 Warwick Blvd., Ste. 100
Newport News, VA 23606

s/ Jeannie Fisher

15814442.2